



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
01/17/2002	Takuya Kobayashi	2002_0037A	5356
7590 02/17/2006		EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.		CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA	
ET N. W.		ARTINIT	PAPER NUMBER
N. DC 20006-1021			.,
	01/17/2002 7590 02/17/2006	01/17/2002 Takuya Kobayashi 7590 02/17/2006 I'H, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. ET N. W.	01/17/2002 Takuya Kobayashi 2002_0037A 7590 02/17/2006 EXAM TH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. ET N. W. ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/046,819	KOBAYASHI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
David G. Cervetti	2136

•		7.11.01.11.0	l			
	David G. Cervetti	2136				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 31 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A						
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
time periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
AMENDMENTS	, ponou oo nana					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause			
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in belappeal; and/or 		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		maliant Amandmant	(DTOL 224)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>46-58</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	hed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
13. Other:						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made.

Furthermore, they raise new arguments that would require further searching and consideration.

Woolsey and Gong clearly teach the receiver and unprotected data authetnication unit (Woolsey, columns 19-21, Gong, pages 3-8).

Kolouch clearly teaches the combination of the unprotected list generation unit, the data generation unit, and the unprotected data authentication unit (columns 3-6).

Furthermore, Cofta (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0016042), cited on the previous office action, discloses loading program modules in a terminal using digital signatures and encryption.

Shear (US Patent 6,157,721) discloses a verifying authority digitally signs a load module or other executable with several different digital signatures and/or signature schemes, a protected processing environment or other secure execution space may require a load module or other executable to present multiple digital signatures before accepting it. An attacker would have to "break" each (all) of the several digital signatures and/or signature schemes to create an unauthorized load module or other executable that would be accepted by the protected processing environment or other secure execution space. Different protected processing environments (secure execution spaces) might examine different subsets of the multiple digital signatures—so that compromising one protected processing environment (secure execution space) will not compromise all of them. As an optimization, a protected processing environment or other secure execution space might verify only one of the several digital signatures (for example, chosen at random each time an executable is used)—thereby speeding up the digital signature verification while still maintaining a high degree of security (column 6, lines 1-67, column 7, lines 1-67).

Atkinson (US Patent Number 5,892,904) discloses a certification or signing method that ensures the authenticity and integrity of a computer program.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
FECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100